



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

aw.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,439	11/26/2001	Jimmy Tsen	06128-266001	9505

26161 7590 09/16/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON PC  
225 FRANKLIN ST  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
----------

PATTERSON, MARIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	3728

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/994,439	TSEN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Marie Patterson	3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 8/15/03.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-27 and 29-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-27 and 29-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 15 August 2003 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 3728

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-27, and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taber (3932950) in view of Giese (5572805) and Campagna (2481389).

Taber shows a shoe (figure 7) and inherent method of making said shoe comprising a molded rubber outsole (5), a molded midsole (26), an upper (22), a base panel (lower portion of 22 shown above element 26 in figure 7), an insole (24), and foxing (52) substantially as claimed except for the exact outsole and midsole and the method of bonding the foxing. Giese teaches forming a sole (figures 78-82) by providing an outsole (5) in a shell shape with a rim and placing the midsole (2 and 3) within the shell shaped outsole and further teaches contouring the midsole. Campagna teaches the use of uncured rubber for a foxing and teaches vulcanizing the foxing (9) to a rubber sole (7) as a method of attaching the foxing to the sole (column 4 lines 20-30). Campagna also teaches placing foxing (9) over a seam formed by the sole (7) and the upper (1), see figure 2. It would have been obvious to provide a contoured midsole and shell shaped outsole as taught by Giese and to form a seam between the outsole and upper and vulcanize a foxing thereon as taught by Campagna in the shoe and method of Taber to increase comfort, support, stability, durability, etc..

Art Unit: 3728

In reference to claim 13, Taber as modified above discloses the claimed invention except for the exact material for the upper. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use canvas or PVU (it is noted that Campagna specifically teaches the use of canvas), since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In reference to claims 14 and 20, it is extremely well known and conventional to use Stroebel stitching to secure uppers to soles. It would have been obvious to use Stroebel stitching as is well known and conventional to attach the sole to the upper in the shoe of Taber as modified above to make the connection more durable and stronger.

In reference to claims 18 and 31, it is well known and conventional to make insoles removable. It would have been obvious to make the insole of Taber as modified above removable so that it may be cleaned, changed, etc. Also, it is noted that the insole of Taber is considered to be "removable" inasmuch as applicant has defined and claimed such.

In reference to claims 19-26, Taber discloses the method of bonding the midsole and outsole (column 2 lines 7-13) to form a sole, attaching the upper to the sole (column 2 lines 58-68 and shown in figure 7), placing the foxing material around the upper and sole and bonding such substantially as claimed except for the exact sole configuration and the exact method of placing the foxing. Giese teaches making a sole by forming an outsole as a shell (5, shown in figures 78-82) and placing a contoured midsole (2 and 3) formed by a contoured last therein. Campagna teaches the method of attaching a shell

shaped outsole (7) to an upper (1) and placing a foxing (9) over the seam and vulcanizing. It would have been obvious to form the midsole/outsole sole as taught by Giese and to attach the sole to the upper as taught by Campagna in the method of making a shoe of Taber to provide a shoe with increased comfort, stability, durability, etc..

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/15/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to the prior art rejections.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA) 1969. In this case, all of the references are directed towards shoes and methods of making/forming the shoes which have foxings and molded elements.

In response to Applicant's argument that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgement on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight

reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392; 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

### ***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

1. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of application or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, "should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the Examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners", M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148 or the **Tech Center 3700 Customer Service Center number is (703) 306-5648**. For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 872-9302. (Note

Art Unit: 3728

that the Examiner **cannot** confirm receipt of faxes) Please identify Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ of Art Unit \_\_\_\_\_ at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries only concerning the **merits** of the examination should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0069.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g. copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, for PTO-892, etc. requests for copies of such papers should be directed to (703) 308-1337.

Check out our web-site at "www.uspto.gov" for fees and other useful information.



Marie Patterson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3728